**ASCC Themes Subcommittee I**

Approved Minutes

Thursday, August 28, 2025 Haggerty Hall 255

**Attendees**: Andridge, Daly, Herrmann, Patson, Lower, Nagar, Ottesen, Rehbeck, Steele, Tuxbury-Gleissner

**Agenda**

1. Welcome and introductions.
2. Overview of the work of the subcommittee
3. Approval of 5-12-25 minutes
	1. Rehbeck, Nagar; approved with 5 abstentions.
4. English 3261 (new course requesting GEN Theme Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations)
	1. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee requests that the department provide a cover letter outlining the changes made to the course in response to the feedback below.
	2. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department amend the paragraph found on p. 3 of the syllabus that describes how English 3261 meets the GEN goals and ELOs. Specifically, they would like this paragraph to draw clearer connections between the course’s topics, activities, and assessments and the GE ELOs.
	3. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee requests that the department provide more information on the GE Submission form regarding ELO 3.2. In particular, they would like to have a more explicit definition of the “‘big idea’ or technological advancement” that is being analyzed, and examples of course activities, such as proposed essay topics or exam questions, that will allow students to demonstrate their mastery of this ELO.
	4. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department provide course-specific goals or learning objectives/outcomes in curriculum.osu.edu (under “Course Details; Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes) rather than the goals of the GEN category.
	5. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee requests that the department provide a more detailed and distinct list of course topics in curriculum.osu.edu (under “Course Details; Content Topic List”) that better outlines the specific topics covered in this particular course.
	6. **Contingency:** As of August 29th, 2025, all syllabi must have either a link to the statements below **or**these statements written out in their entirety within the syllabus (the statement(s) in **bold** below are missing from the current syllabus). Syllabi should link to the Office of Undergraduate Education's [Syllabus Policies & Statements webpage](https://ugeducation.osu.edu/academics/syllabus-policies-statements) and/or copy-and-paste the statements from the Office of Undergraduate Education's website.
		1. Academic Misconduct
		2. Student Life - Disability Services
		3. Religious Accommodations
		4. **Intellectual Diversity**

Instructors are also welcome to include any other standard and/or recommended syllabus statements found on the Office of Undergraduate Education's webpage which they deem relevant for their course. Please also refer to this page to ensure that any statements written out in the syllabus are current and accurate.

* 1. Comment: The Subcommittee notes that the use of the word “reflection” in contexts *other* than the self-reflection required in ELO 2.2 may be confusing for students. For example, on p. 5 of the syllabus, Option A for the Analytical Essay assignment is entitled “Interpretation Plus Reflection”, but ELO 2.2 is not listed as being addressed by this assignment.
	2. Andridge, Ottesen; approved with **six contingencies** (in bold above) and one comment.
1. Classics 3701 (new course requesting GEN Theme Lived Environments)
	1. **Contingency:** As of August 29th, 2025, all syllabi must have either a link to the statements below **or**these statements written out in their entirety within the syllabus (the statement(s) in **bold** below are missing from the current syllabus). Syllabi should link to the Office of Undergraduate Education's [Syllabus Policies & Statements webpage](https://ugeducation.osu.edu/academics/syllabus-policies-statements) and/or copy-and-paste the statements from the Office of Undergraduate Education's website.
		1. Academic Misconduct
		2. Student Life - Disability Services
		3. Religious Accommodations
		4. **Intellectual Diversity**

Instructors are also welcome to include any other standard and/or recommended syllabus statements found on the Office of Undergraduate Education's webpage which they deem relevant for their course. Please also refer to this page to ensure that the Diversity Statement on p. 8 of the syllabus (now the statement on “Creating an Environment Free from Harassment, Discrimination, and Sexual Misconduct”) and all other statements are current and accurate.

* 1. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department re-word the statement on p. 1 of the syllabus that says, “This course fulfills the general requirements and expected learning outcomes for GE Themes.” Since this is a three-credit hour course, Classics 3701 does not, in and of itself, fulfill the GEN Requirements for the Lived Environments category (students must complete 4-6 CH in the Theme). Instead, the Subcommittee suggests the following wording: “Classics 3701 is approved as a part of the GEN Theme: Lived Environments category.”
	2. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends that the department consider asking students to complete a self-reflection assignment near the beginning of the semester as well as at the end of the semester to encourage students to consider what they have gained from the course.
	3. Rehbeck, Patson; approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above) and *one recommendation* (in italics above).
1. Pharmacy 3710 (new course requesting GEN Theme Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations) (return) FULLY APPROVED BY TAG; ONLY NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED BY ASCC THEMES SUBCOMMITTEE
	1. Comment: The Subcommittee greatly appreciates the unit’s attention to their prior feedback; they find the course to be much improved and are excited to have it be a part of the GEN category.
	2. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee requests that the department provide a cover letter outlining the changes made to the course in response to the feedback below.
	3. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee notes from the unit’s cover letter that the course will now be offered in an asynchronous rather than a synchronous format. While the subcommittee does not necessarily object to this change, the syllabus (p. 4, p. 13, etc.) and the GEN Submission form still mention synchronous class sessions and course activities, thus making it difficult to discern whether the GEN Goals and ELO’s will be met given the course’s new format. Specifically, the subcommittee asks that the following be addressed:
		1. While the Subcommittee assumes there will now be recorded lectures, the ambiguity in the syllabus made it challenging for the reviewers (and likely for students) to discern how course content will be delivered. The Subcommittee asks that the department clarify this and remove the references to synchronous class meetings in the syllabus.
		2. P. 7 of the syllabus mentions “six asynchronous discussions” to be completed over the course of the semester. However, p. 4 of the syllabus and the GEN Submission form (ELO 2.1) mention weekly discussions, often in conjunction with weekly synchronous Zoom meetings. It is unclear what the relationship is between these two types discussions in the new class format, and how they relate to the fulfillment of the GEN goals and ELOs (especially ELO 2.1). The Subcommittee asks that this be clarified in the submission documents.
	4. **Contingency:** As of August 29th, 2025, all syllabi must have either a link to the statements below **or**these statements written out in their entirety within the syllabus (the statement(s) in **bold** below are missing from the current syllabus). Syllabi should link to the Office of Undergraduate Education's [Syllabus Policies & Statements webpage](https://ugeducation.osu.edu/academics/syllabus-policies-statements) and/or copy-and-paste the statements from the Office of Undergraduate Education's website.
		1. Academic Misconduct
		2. Student Life - Disability Services
		3. Religious Accommodations
		4. **Intellectual Diversity**

Instructors are also welcome to include any other standard and/or recommended syllabus statements found on the Office of Undergraduate Education's webpage which they deem relevant for their course. Please also refer to this page to ensure that any statements written out in the syllabus are current and accurate.

* 1. Ottesen, Rehbeck; unanimously approved with **three contingencies** (in bold above) and one comment.
1. WGSS 3400 (new course requesting GEN Theme Health and Wellbeing)
	1. Tabled for time
2. Civics, Law, and Leadership 3250 (new course requesting GEN Theme Health and Wellbeing)
	1. The Subcommittee requests that the department provide a cover letter outlining the changes made to the course in response to the feedback below.
	2. The Subcommittee does not believe that the course, in its current form, meets the GEN Health and Wellbeing Goals 1 and 2, and their attendant ELOs. The Subcommittee offers the following comments to aid the Center in altering/augmenting the course:
		1. ELO 1.1 – The Subcommittee asks that the Center amend the course’s assignments to ensure that students are engaging in “critical and logical thinking about the topic or idea of the theme” at an advanced level. They note that the Center cites the course’s essays and exams as tools for meeting this ELO, but it is unclear what secondary scholarship or sources students will use to support the crafting of a logical, critical argument on the given topics or how they will be directed and supported to identify appropriate sources if locating and evaluating sources is part of the assignment. Furthermore, the Subcommittee notes that in most advanced courses, students may be assigned a topic for an essay but are expected to come up with their own thesis statement, argument, and supporting evidence drawn from a variety of primary and secondary sources rather than being supplied with a prompt that steers them toward writing about personal opinions and experiences.
		2. ELO 1.2 – The Subcommittee asks that the Center augment the course’s materials to include more “in-depth and scholarly exploration of the theme” (per the Goals and ELOs for all Theme courses). Specifically, they are concerned that students are relying on solely on material provided by the instructor and their own/peers’ impressions for interpretation of the primary texts and the topic of health and wellbeing, rather than engaging with scholarly writings that present a variety of viewpoints on the primary texts and their relationship to contemporary debates and discourses surrounding health and wellbeing. Such scholarly sources should make up a significant percentage of the course materials, so as to provide clear examples for students regarding the type of writing and advanced academic arguments that should be produced at this level and give ample opportunity for students to engage with review and critique of advanced rhetoric.
		3. ELO 2.1 – While the Subcommittee notes and appreciates the integration of students’ own experiences into the course material, they would like to see the inclusion of more opportunities for students to “identify, describe, and synthesize” different approaches to the interpretation of the primary texts and their relationship to health and wellbeing, especially approaches that incorporate recent scholarship and cutting edge research within the field.
		4. ELO 2.2 – The Subcommittee asks that the Center incorporate into the course opportunities for students to demonstrate their “developing sense of self as a learner” in an assessable manner. While the subcommittee notes and appreciates the attempt to build on students’ prior experiences about the topic of the course, this ELO is focused on students’ awareness of their own learning and reflection on/analysis of the ways that their thinking has changed over the duration of the course. While the Subcommittee acknowledges that there are many methods for assessing this ELO, they offer the friendly suggestion that asking students to complete a graded reflection on course topics at the beginning, mid-point, and end of the semester can be a simple and effective way to meet this ELO.
	3. Given that the course engages with several commonly assigned texts, the Subcommittee recommends that the Center include in the syllabus a policy about the use of generative AI.
	4. The Subcommittee asks that the Center provide additional information in the syllabus (p. 5) about how the midterm and final exams will provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate their mastery of the GEN ELOs and engage with topics surrounding health and wellbeing.
	5. The Subcommittee encourages the Center to consider a scaffolded approach to some or all of the courses writing assignments to provide students with support as they develop their advanced writing skills.
	6. Should the Center have questions about the feedback above, the Subcommittee Chair, Philip Tuxbury-Gleissner, is willing to meet with the unit’s representatives and provide additional context. The Subcommittee also recommends examining some of the [exemplar proposals for the Health and Wellbeing Theme,](https://asccas.osu.edu/general-education-program/gen-race-ethnicity-and-gender-diversity-themes-information/gen-themes) as well as the [new rubrics related to each Theme.](https://asccas.osu.edu/general-education-program/gen-race-ethnicity-and-gender-diversity-themes-information/gen-themes-0)  Both of these resources (and others) are available on the [ASCCAS website](https://asccas.osu.edu/).
	7. The Subcommittee declined to vote on the course at this time.